



Handwritten initials: JH, JTW

FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.

A REGISTERED LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP

2200 ROSS AVENUE, SUITE 2800

DALLAS, TEXAS 75201-2784

WWW.FULBRIGHT.COM

TBALLANCE@FULBRIGHT.COM

DIRECT DIAL: (214) 855-8356

TELEPHONE: (214) 855-8000

FACSIMILE: (214) 855-8200

October 27, 2008

09/927,972

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O Box 1450  
Alexandria VA 22313-1450

Re: Receipt of Office Action

Dear Commissioner:

Please note that this Office Action was received by mistake in our office on October 27, 2008. Please also note that the serial number, art unit number and confirmation number do not match the same on the official action.

The serial number listed on the official action does not belong to our office.

Very truly yours,

Tamerie Ballance

TAB/tb  
Attachment



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/927,972	08/10/2001	Woodrow W. Grandy	68554/P001US/10801996	5997

29053 7590 10/23/2008  
FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.  
2200 ROSS AVENUE  
SUITE 2800  
DALLAS, TX 75201-2784



EXAMINER
BLACK, LINH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2169	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/23/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

~~FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI, LLP  
IPT DOCKETING  
Docketed ☐ Not Req'd ☐ Confirmation ☐  
Initials 1st \_\_\_\_\_ Initials 2nd \_\_\_\_\_  
OCT 27 2008  
Attorney \_\_\_\_\_  
Docket No. T-System  
Action Req'd P001US/10801996 Date Due \_\_\_\_\_~~



# Office Action Summary

Application No.

11/176,948

Applicant(s)

MAKELA, MIKKO

Examiner

Stephen Alvesteffer

Art Unit

2175

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 August 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119


- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

Art Unit: 2175



## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

This Office Action is responsive to the Request for Continued Examination (RCE) filed August 22, 2008. Claims 1, 2, 11-21, 23, 25, 29, and 30 are amended. Claim 31 is new. Claims 1, 11, 21, 23, 25, 27, and 29 are independent. Claims 1-31 remain pending.

### ***Claim Objections***

**Claim 1** is objected to because of the following informalities:

- "the second section" lacks antecedent basis.

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6, 11-16, 21, 23, 25, and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Filner et al. (hereinafter Filner), United States Patent Application Publication 2005/0210399, and Grillo et al. (hereinafter Grillo), United States Patent 6,717,589.

**Regarding claim 1**, Filner teaches a method comprising: receiving a section selection signal indicative of a first section of a page on a display (see Filner paragraph [0006]; *"presents a thumbnail image of a content such as a web page, allows a viewer to select a region, and zooms in on the selected region in a way that reduces scrolling and helps users to understand the content they are reading"*); showing a first tooltip describing content of the first section of the page, in response to the section selection signal, and marking a border between the first section and the second section, wherein the first tooltips are superimposed on at least part of the page (see Filner Figure 4 and paragraph [0035]; *"the panel 305 has been selected, and a tooltip 402 is popped-up to show the user the text of the first line of text of that panel"*). Filner does not explicitly disclose displaying a second tooltip at a time when the first tooltip is shown, only if the second section is adjacent to said first section, wherein the second tooltip describes content of a second section. Grillo teaches displaying multiple tooltips describing sections that are adjacent to one another (see Grillo Figure 4B, showing multiple tooltips for sections adjacent to each other). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would recognize that displaying multiple tooltips for adjacent sections (as shown by Grillo) might be helpful to users in the context of Filner's invention. Such a combination would allow users to immediately see all relevant help information without having to move the cursor all over the screen.

**Regarding claim 2**, Filner/Grillo teaches receiving a section display signal; and displaying a larger version of a selected section of the page, in response to the section display signal (see Filner paragraph [0041]; *"Once a region is thus moved to, that region*

*may be selected and zoomed in on, that is, the region is expanded to cover most of the screen").*

**Regarding claim 3,** Filner/Grillo teaches that the first section of the page is one of a plurality of sections respectively having a plurality of tooltips, and wherein substantially any point in the page corresponds to one and only one of the tooltips (see Filner paragraph [0009]; *"While in the thumbnail viewing state, the user navigates among the panels using the buttons, keys and/or icons. While moving around among the panels, some visual indication (a cursor) is given as to which panel the user is currently residing on and would select for zooming, such as by tapping the navigation button. Because the thumbnail view is relatively small, a tooltip or the like may be arranged to pop up and give the user some context as to what content is in the focused panel"*).

**Regarding claim 4,** Filner/Grillo teaches that the section selection signal selects a section having a maximum number of occurrences of a search term (see Filner Figure 4 and paragraph [0017]; *"FIG. 4 is a... representation of a tooltip that can appear when navigating over a panelized region of content"*, the section selection signal is being interpreted as meaning hovering the cursor over a section so as to invoke the tool tip. A user is inherently capable of hovering the cursor over a section having a maximum number of occurrences of a search term.).

**Regarding claim 5,** Filner/Grillo teaches that the section selection signal selects a section that has changed since the page was previously loaded, or selects a section where a cursor is located (see Filner Figure 4 and paragraph [0034]; *"While moving*

*around among the panels, some visual indication is given as to which panel the user is currently residing on and would select if the navigation button 208 was tapped, that is, which panel has "focus" (but has not yet been selected for zooming). For example, the panel may be surrounded by a visibly distinct (e.g., colored) border; a dark border is shown around the panel 305 in FIG. 4", the section selection signal is being interpreted as meaning hovering the cursor over a section so as to invoke the tool tip. A user is inherently capable of hovering the cursor over a section that has changed since the page was previously loaded).*

**Regarding claim 6**, Filner/Grillo teaches that the displaying excludes all sections of the page other than the selected section from being displayed (see Filner paragraph [0041]; *"Once a region is thus moved to, that region may be selected and zoomed in on, that is, the region is expanded to cover most of the screen"*, expanding the region to cover most of the screen will exclude all other regions of the page from being displayed).

**Claims 11-16** recite an apparatus performing substantially the same limitations as the method of claims 1-6, respectively. Therefore, the claims are rejected under the same rationale.

**Claim 21** recites a software product performing substantially the same limitations as the method of claim 1. Therefore, claim 21 is rejected under the same rationale.

**Claim 23** recites a system performing substantially the same limitations as the method of claim 1. Therefore, claim 23 is rejected under the same rationale.

**Claim 25** recites a network element performing substantially the same limitations as the method of claim 1. Therefore, claim 25 is rejected under the same rationale.

**Claims 29 and 30** recite an apparatus having substantially the same limitations as the method of claims 1 and 2, respectively. Therefore, the claims are rejected under the same rationale.

**Regarding claim 31**, Filner/Grillo teaches that said marking specially indicates sections that are described by the tooltips (see Filner paragraph [0034]; *"While in the thumbnail viewing state, the user uses the navigation button 208 to move among the panels until one is selected by tapping the navigation button 208. While moving around among the panels, some visual indication is given as to which panel the user is currently residing on and would select if the navigation button 208 was tapped, that is, which panel has "focus" (but has not yet been selected for zooming). For example, the panel may be surrounded by a visibly distinct (e.g., colored) border; a dark border is shown around the panel 305 in FIG. 4"*).

Claims 7, 8, 17, 18, 22, 24, and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Filner (2005/0210399) *supra*, Grillo (6,717,589) *supra*, and Kanevsky, United States Patent 6,300,947.

**Regarding claim 7**, Filner/Grillo substantially teaches that the first tooltip comprises a textual summary of the first section, wherein the textual summary contains prioritized information about the first section, and wherein if there is too much prioritized information to fit in space allotted for the first tooltip then only highest priority items are



included in the first tooltip (see Filner paragraph [0035]; *"a tooltip or the like may be arranged to pop up and give the user some context as to what content is in the focused panel. In the example of FIG. 4, the panel 305 has been selected, and a tooltip 402 is popped-up to show the user the text of the first line of text of that panel"*).

However, Filner teaches prioritizing only the initial text in the first section, but does not explicitly disclose excluding lower-priority content that does not fit on the tooltip. Kanevsky teaches prioritizing data items in a web page to fit on small displays (see Kanevsky column 11 lines 14-24; *"objects in group S1 are prioritized in the prioritizer 802. Therein, objects are numerated in accordance with their importance. The priority is taken into account in further transformations of web pages. For example, if a first object has higher priority than another object and both objects cannot together fit a small display screen, then the object of higher priority is displayed on the screen and the object of lower priority is displayed as a hypertext link to another (newly created) web page where such lower priority object can be fully displayed"*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to prioritize the data from web pages as taught by Kanevsky for display in the tool tip windows as taught by Filner/Grillo so that the data in the tooltips remain readable and descriptive on small screen devices.

**Regarding claim 8,** Filner/Grillo/Kanevsky teaches that the prioritized information prioritizes at least two of the following: header elements in the first section; larger or bolded text in the first section; labels of a form in the first section; initial text in the first section; and keywords in the first section (see Kanevsky column 10 line 66

through column 11 line 13; *"The first group, S1, includes data items whose sizes can be estimated from a web script (e.g., URL/CGI instructions). The second group, S2, includes remaining items. The objects in group S1 are sent to a prioritizer module 802 for further transformations and reorganization in new web pages that fit a particular screen size"*; see also Filner paragraph [0035]; *"the panel 305 has been selected, and a tooltip 402 is popped-up to show the user the text of the first line of text of that panel"*).

**Claims 17 and 18** recite an apparatus performing substantially the same limitations as the method of claims 7 and 8, respectively. Therefore, the claims are rejected under the same rationale.

**Claim 22** recites a software product performing substantially the same limitations as the method of claim 7. Therefore, claim 22 is rejected under the same rationale.

**Claim 24** recites a system performing substantially the same limitations as the method of claim 7. Therefore, claim 24 is rejected under the same rationale.

**Claim 26** recites a network element performing substantially the same limitations as the method of claim 7. Therefore, claim 26 is rejected under the same rationale.

**Claims 27 and 28** recite a method performing substantially the same limitations as the method of claims 7 and 8, respectively. Therefore, the claims are rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 10 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Filner (2005/0210399) *supra*, Grillo (6,717,589) *supra*, and Clark et al. (hereinafter Clark), United States Patent 5,995,101.

**Regarding claim 10**, Filner/Grillo teaches every limitation of claim 10 except that only one adjacent tooltip is shown at a time. Clark teaches a multi-level tool tip wherein only one adjacent tooltip is shown at a time (see Clark column 5 line 47 through column 6 line 4; *"One or more of the multiple tip levels may appear concurrently on the display, e.g., in cascaded fashion"*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to display adjacent tooltips one at a time as taught by Clark in the invention of Filner/Grillo so that all of the tooltips can fit on a small screen display.

**Claim 20** recites an electronic device performing substantially the same limitations as the method of claim 10. Therefore, claim 20 is rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 9 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Filner (2005/0210399) *supra*, Grillo (6,717,589) *supra*, and Wattenberg, United States Patent Application Publication number 2004/0205575.

**Regarding claim 9**, Filner/Grillo teaches every limitation of claim 9 except searching the page for a search term; and including search hit information in the first tooltip or the second tooltip. Wattenberg teaches searching a page for a search term (see Wattenberg paragraph [0034]; *"a search engine could mark words and/or images in a returned Web page according to the degree of relevance to the search"*) and including search hit information in the tooltip (see Wattenberg Figure 4 and paragraph [0045]; *"hit-count or click through data may be stored in the copy or snapshot of the*

*Web page in the form of pop-up text that is displayed when the user moves the mouse over a hyperlink*"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include search hit information as taught by Wattenberg in the tooltips of Filner/Grillo in order to convey information that is relevant to the context of the current user interface actions.

**Claim 19** recites an electronic device performing substantially the same limitations as the method of claim 9. Therefore, claim 9 is rejected under the same rationale.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Claims 1 and 21 were amended to conform more closely with the language in the specification. Accordingly, the 35 USC 112 rejection, second paragraph rejection of claims 1-10, 21, and 22 is withdrawn.

Claims 2, 12, and 30 were amended to remove a limitation previously rejected as new matter under 35 USC 112, first paragraph. Accordingly, the 35 USC 112, first paragraph rejection of claims 2, 6, 12, 16, and 30 is withdrawn.

Applicant asserts that Grillo does not teach or suggest that tooltips are only provided for adjacent sections of a page. The examiner respectfully disagrees.

Applicant cites Grillo Figure 4B, showing tooltip 68k not being adjacent to tooltip 68b. However, examiner notes that every section showing a tooltip in Grillo is adjacent

to another section showing a tooltip. Grillo shows no section with a displayed tooltip that is not clearly adjacent to another section with a displayed tooltip.

Applicant further asserts that Filner does not disclose any special marking of the border of the section for which the tooltip is shown. The examiner respectfully disagrees. At paragraph [0034], Filner specifically teaches, *"While in the thumbnail viewing state, the user uses the navigation button 208 to move among the panels until one is selected by tapping the navigation button 208. While moving around among the panels, some **visual indication is given as to which panel the user is currently residing on** and would select if the navigation button 208 was tapped, that is, which panel has "focus" (but has not yet been selected for zooming). For example, **the panel may be surrounded by a visibly distinct (e.g., colored) border**, a dark border is shown around the panel 305 in FIG. 4"* (emphasis added).

Applicant asserts that Filner does not teach or suggest that a tooltip will sometimes exclude prioritized information about a section. Upon further examination of the cited prior art, the examiner agrees. However, examiner notes that such exclusion of prioritized information is clearly disclosed by previously cited prior art Kanevsky clearly discloses excluding prioritized information on small screen devices (see Kanevsky column 11 lines 14-24; *"objects in group S1 are prioritized in the prioritizer 802. Therein, objects are numerated in accordance with their importance. The priority is taken into account in further transformations of web pages. For example, if a first object*

*has higher priority than another object and both objects cannot together fit a small display screen, then the object of higher priority is displayed on the screen and the object of lower priority is displayed as a hypertext link to another (newly created) web page where such lower priority object can be fully displayed").*

### **Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen Alvesteffer whose telephone number is (571)270-1295. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:30AM-6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Bashore can be reached on (571)272-4088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 11/176,948  
Art Unit: 2175

Page 13

Stephen Alvesteffer  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2175

/S. A./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2175

/Kieu D Vu/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2175